



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/316,040	05/21/1999	PHILIP W GILLIS	2925-0224/GI	7281
30594	7590	07/27/2004	EXAMINER	
HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.			DAS, CHAMELI	
P.O. BOX 8910			ART UNIT	
RESTON, VA 20195			PAPER NUMBER	
			2122	

DATE MAILED: 07/27/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Art Unit: 2122

1. This action is in response to the reconsideration filed on 7/13/04.
2. Claims 16, 55-56 have been canceled.
3. New claims 66-67 have been added.
4. Claims 1-15 and 57-67 have been rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 66-67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Tidwell et al, the article, "TaskGuides: Instant Wizards on the Web" published in ACM on 1997.

For the rejection of claim 66, see the rejection of claim 1 in the previous office action (Paper # 23).

For claim 67, (Tidwell, page 266, column 1 and column 2).

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed on 5/13/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In the remark, the applicant has argued in substance:

(1) Tidwell et al fail to suggest, teach or disclose a method for creating a wizard including prompting input of process steps and a plurality of potential selection associated with each of the process steps, as recited in the independent claims 1, 20, 36, 44 and 66.

Response:

(1) Tidwell discloses the method of creating a wizard (page 264, lines 1-6, “our primary design goal was to make wizards easy to implement... visual design tool”), page 264, col 1, section: “The Benefits of SGML”, this section clearly indicates that the customer can modify a wizard and able to create wizards that generate other wizard.

Tidwell discloses “prompting input of process steps” (page 264, col 2, lines 18-25, “SGML approach is that it makes it very easy to create recursive wizards. These “wizard wizards” that ask the user a series of questions to complete a task. When the user completes the task, the output is a second wizard”, where “ask the user a series of questions to complete a task” is the prompting input of process steps as recited in the claims.

Tidwell discloses “plurality of potential selection associated with each process steps” (page 265, col 2, lines 9-30), where user can select any name like A, B or C. On page 266, col 1, lines 1-21, where the prompt is “what kind of network do you have” and the plurality of choices are “Token ring”, “Ethernet”.

(2) Tidwell discloses a technology that allows an end user to combine or remove steps and to add installation specific information, not creating a wizard.

Response;

(2) Tidwell discloses a method of creating a wizard and the installation process of the wizard, (page 266, col 2, lines 29-33, page 269, col 1, lines 1-10). Tidwell discloses the method of creating a wizard from another wizard (page 264, col 2, line 18-25).

These wizards are developed by the user's choice of selection (page 267, col 1, lines 37-41).

(3) *Microsoft Computer Dictionary fails to disclose "a method for creating a wizard including prompting input of process steps and a plurality of potential selections associated with each of the process steps" as recited in independent claim 1.*

Response:

(3) Microsoft Computer Dictionary does not disclose "a method for creating a wizard including prompting input of process steps and a plurality of potential selections associated with each of the process steps". Tidwell disclosure discloses "a method for creating a wizard including prompting input of process steps and a plurality of potential selections associated with each of the process steps". See the response of the arguments above.

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

Art Unit: 2122

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chameli Das whose telephone number is (703) 305-1339. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 7:00 A.M. to 3:30 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Dam can be reached on 703-305-4552. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306 (official fax).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-9600.

Chameli C. Das
CHAMELI C. DAS
PRIMARY EXAMINER
7/20/04